

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,907
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office action electronically delivered on July 25, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the instant application, wherein no claims have been amended. Claims 1 and 12 are independent claims.

Applicants have noted with great appreciation that previous rejections of the claims have been withdrawn; nevertheless, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection have been made in view of Abe et al. (USPN 5,705,879; hereinafter "Abe"), Williams (USPN 6,087,787; hereinafter "Williams"), and Lin et al. (USPN 7,057,611; hereinafter "Lin").

Referring to numbered page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-7, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Williams. Further, as indicated in numbered page 5 of the Office action, claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe and Williams as applied to claims 1-7, 10 and 11 above, and further in view of Lin. In numbered page 6, it is exhibited that claims 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, Williams and Lin.

Applicant has proposed claim amendments as provided above without introducing any new matter, and hereby respectfully submits that the amended claims are fully supported by the specification. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-8 and

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,907
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

10-17 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Williams. Further, claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe and Williams as applied to claims 1-7, 10 and 11 above, and further in view of Lin. Claims 12-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe, Williams and Lin. Applicants respectfully controvert the above rejections on the following grounds.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

With respect to claim 1, as amended, it recites in part,

“A LCD lighting control system, comprising:

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,907
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

...

a self-oscillation inverter, coupled to a power source and the lamp, for converting electrical energy from the power source to the lamp, the self-oscillation inverter operating with a self-oscillation frequency;

a DC/DC power converter circuit, coupled to the self-oscillation inverter and the power source, operated with a operation frequency;

...

a modulator, ... for outputting a control signal synchronized with the self-oscillation frequency to the DC/DC power converter circuit for controlling the operation frequency of the DC/DC power converter circuit by the control signal."

(Emphasis added)

In the amended claim 1, applicants jointed the DC/DC power converter circuit into the LCD lighting control system. But in the specification of the present invention, the DC/DC power converter circuit is implemented by a buck circuit. A person of ordinary skill in the art should know that the buck circuit is a kind of a DC/DC power converter, so the jointed DC/DC power converter circuit didn't introduce any new matter in claim 1.

As marked in the above claim 1, the DC/DC power converter is operated with the operation frequency, and the control signal outputted from the modulator is used to control the operation frequency. Due to the control signal synchronized with the self-oscillation frequency, the operation frequency can be synchronized with the self-oscillation frequency to avoid ripple effect.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,907
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

According to observation of Fig. 3 in present invention, the modulator 120 outputs the control signal to a gate terminal of a transistor of the buck circuit 110 for controlling whether the transistor is ON or OFF. Further the operation frequency of the buck circuit 110 will be controlled by the the modulator 120 to make the operation frequency and the self-oscillation frequency be synchronized.

Abe and Williams of the prior art of record failed to teach or suggest a DC/DC power converter, and didn't teach or suggest that a control signal synchronized with the self-oscillation frequency is used to control the operation frequency of the DC/DC power converter. Consequently, since not all the technical features of Applicant's independent claim 1 are taught or suggested by the combination of Abe and Williams or the prior art of record, the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are traversed, and thus claim 1 should be allowed.

As such, claim 1 of the present invention and its dependent claims 2-8 and 10-11 are submitted to be non-obvious and patently distinct from Abe and Williams, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Likewise, Applicants submit that claim 12 contains all limitations presented in claim 1 including the above discussed features bringing patentable weight to claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed hereinbefore, claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-17 are submitted to be allowable as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,907
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-8 and 10-17 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

Oct. 24. 2007

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jciipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jciipgroup.com.tw